

Appl. No. 09/844,658  
Amdt. dated October 13, 2005  
Reply to Office action of July 15, 2005  
Page 4

### REMARKS

In the above reference Office Action, the claims were rejected under 35 USC 102 and 35 USC 103. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Faisandier in view of Causey, III et al. ("Causey"). Applicant respectfully traverses.

The Examiner acknowledges the Faisandier fails to teach that the hardware module is deployable to a plurality of medical device interface instruments and relies upon Causey to teach programming heading having some processing capability resident within it. Claim 6 was rejected under 35 USC 102 in view of Snell and separately in view of Faisandier.

Claims 1 and 6 have been amended to more clearly indicate that an interface capability is provided for different types of medical device interface instruments. Snell and Faisandier deal solely with a single device; a standard programmer. Thus, no references, alone or in combination have been provided that teach the claims as amended. As such, Applicant respectfully asserts that the claims are in condition for allowance and requests notice of the same. If any issues remain outstanding, the Examiner is respectfully urged to telephone the undersigned to expedite prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,

Date

10/13/05



Daniel G. Chapik  
Reg. No. 43,424  
(763) 514-3066  
Customer No. 27581